

From: Priscilla Burton
To: Daron Haddock; Jim Smith; Wayne Western
Date: 1/29/03 1:37PM
Subject: Re: Fwd: Amended TA_99C-7

I have looked at Dennis' comments. The correction he made under **General Contents Permit Application Format and Contents** is accurate.

None of the other comments related to topsoil/subsoil sections of the TA are appropriate as discussed below.

Operation Plan/Topsoil/Subsoil

The waste is toxic as determined by sampling conducted in 1980 through 1983. Recent sampling in 2001 confirmed the toxicity of the waste due to sodicity and selenium. A 2002 sampling program was to be conducted to determine the extent of the toxic material. Page 2-3 of Section R645-301-200 supports these conclusions. No information should be deleted from this section.

Reclamation Plan/Topsoil Subsoil

After going to the site (4/24/2002) and discussing this with Dennis Oakley, my understanding was that salvaging the upper 24 four inches of the outslope would continue to be in the plan, but that the salvage of soils from the drainage would provide the bulk of the substitute topsoil cover. However, I've looked through the submittals and the plan does not support this agreement that I thought we had reached. I think the plan should indicate salvage and use of the surface 24 inches of the vegetated outslope. **If this is the only issue to be discussed I will call him personally, otherwise do we need a conference call?**

In a separate issue, the disputed Findings written for this section are based on statements made on pages 2-2 and 2-3, Section R645-301-200 of the submittal and should not be deleted.

Reclamation Plan/Stablilization of Surface Areas

These sentences are taken directly from the submittal page 2-4 Section R645-301-244. And the statements mimic the R645-301-244.300 through 244.320 language. If PacifiCorps does not intend to comply with these rules, the Division must educate them about the requirements.

>>> Daron Haddock Monday, January 27, 2003 4:09:33 PM >>>

We approved this amendment on January 14th, 2003, however, when Dennis Oakley recieved the TA he had some questions about some of the statements made in it.

He felt some some things were incorrect. He has subsequently revised the TA with what he believes to be more accurate information and it is attached with red-line/strikeout. Would each of you look at it and let me know if it is okay? Thanks.

CC: Pam Grubaugh-Littig